

REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed September 23, 2005. At the time of the Office Action, Claims 1, 5-17, 19-30, 32-41, 43-46, and 48-57 were pending in this Application. Claims 1, 5-17, 19-30, 32-41, 43-46, and 48-57 were rejected. Claims 1, 15, 16, 27, 30, 36, 37, 40, 43, 46, 52, 53, 56, and 57 have been amended to further define various features of Applicants' invention. Claim 17 has been cancelled without prejudice. Claims 2-4, 18, 31, 42, and 47 were previously cancelled by Applicants without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1, 5-17, 19-30, 32-41, 43-46, and 48-57 were rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over non-patent document Wallys W. Conhaim's "Thomas Publishing" dated Jul/Aug 1998 ("Conhaim") in view of non-patent document Edwards, Inc. website at www.Edwardsinc.com ("Edwards"), and further in view of non-patent document "Thomasregister.com" from website of <http://www.thomasregister.com>, archived 16 November 1999 at <http://www.waybackmachine.org> ("ThomasRegister.com"). Applicants respectfully traverse and submit the cited art combinations, even if proper, which Applicants do not concede, does not render the claimed embodiment of the invention obvious.

In order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the references cited by the Examiner must disclose all claimed limitations. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 U.S.P.Q. 580 (C.C.P.A. 1974).

Independent Claims 1, 27, 30, 36, 40, 43, 46, 52, 56 and 57 each recite a system or method that includes a step or means of providing information relating to at least two relocation services for relocating industrial equipment. Additionally, the relocation services are provided by more than one service provider.

Examiner cites to Conhaim, Edwards and ThomasRegister.com as rendering obvious all of the Independent Claims. However, the systems and methods described in Conhaim, Edwards and ThomasRegister.com are directed to typical methods of online marketing. More specifically, Conhaim and ThomasRegister.com relate to an on-line version of the traditional

Thomas Register directory of manufacturers that includes additional features such as allowing purchasers to email messages to companies of their choosing. However, Conhaim and ThomasRegister.com teach a directory style service in which products and services are listed by each provider--ThomasRegister.com does not appear to teach the listing of product offerings along with complimentary relocation services provided by two or more relocation service providers, as claimed.

The Edwards reference appears to be a website of an industrial general and mechanical company. According to the Edwards website, Edwards “provide[s] personnel with extensive experience in rigging, millwright services, equipment relocation, transportation and installation . . .” Edwards page 2. Edwards provides no information related to equipment relocation services other than that they have employees with experience in relocation services and Edwards does not provide information related to relocation services from two or more service providers.

Applicants submit that Conhaim, Edwards and ThomasRegister.com, considered separately and in combination, fail to disclose, teach or suggest providing information related to “at least two relocation services . . . provided by at least two different service providers” as recited in the Independent Claims. Instead, the cited references relate to traditional marketing techniques in which information is provided for a single service provider. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration, withdrawal of the § 103 rejections and full allowance of Independent Claims 1, 27, 30, 36, 40, 43, 46, 52, 56 and 57 and Claims 5-16, 19-26, 28-29, 32-35, 37-39, 41, 44-45, 48-51 and 53-55 which depend therefrom.

CONCLUSION

Applicants have now made an earnest effort to place this case in condition for allowance in light of the amendments and remarks set forth above. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the Claims as presented herein.

Applicants believe there are no fees due at this time, however, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees to Deposit Account No. 50-2148 of Baker Botts L.L.P. in order to effectuate this filing.

If there are any matters concerning this Application that may be cleared up in a telephone conversation, please contact Applicants' attorney at 512.322.2545.

Respectfully submitted,
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
Attorney for Applicants



Andreas Grubert
Limited Recognition No. L0225
Expires June 30, 2006
Limited Recognition Under 37 C.F.R. §11.9(b)

Date: December 21, 2005

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
CUSTOMER ACCOUNT NO. **31625**
512.322.2545
512.322.8383 (fax)